



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/353,583 07/15/99 REICHGOTT

S GEN-040

EXAMINER

LMC1/0816

RONALD P KANANEN ESQ
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
THE LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N W
WASHINGTON DC 20036

TRAN, H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2711

DATE MAILED:

08/16/00

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/353,583

Applicant(s)

REICHGOTT ET AL.

Examiner

Hai Tran

Art Unit

2711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
 2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) ____.
 3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/05/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 41, applicant argued "While So may disclose dual processors multiprocessing in a dual processing mode generally, So does not teach or suggest the functions performed by each processor, as recited in claim 41."

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with argument above. It is noted that the multiprocessing or multithread processing in a dual-processing mode is well known in the computer art. The operating system could define the order of processing of any tasks presented by the application to the first or the second processor or both at any given time during the process, see So, Fig.94 and 95, Col.151, lines 39-67+. After a careful consideration of the stated limitations "first processor is dedicated to provide a user interface and a second processor is dedicated to manage the download", So clearly meets the claimed limitations as argued by applicant.

Furthermore, Cloutier et al. (US 5847771) also discloses the claimed limitations, see Fig.3, Col.11, lines 14-22; therefore, the Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 41.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 10, 16, 18, 24-25, 34 and 36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2711

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4, 7-17, 21-22, 24-27, 30-36, 39, 40 and 42 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al.(US 5666293) in view of Metz et al.(US 5978855).

Regarding claims 1 and 18 a set-top terminal for connecting a subscriber to a cable network, the terminal comprising:

A processor (Fig.6, element 110); and

A memory unit (Fig.6, element 120);

The processor only accepts the download on the specified in-band channel (Col.9, lines 40-45) and records the download in the memory unit (Col.10, lines 1-5) when one or more predetermined criteria are satisfied (Col.4, lines 29-34), the criteria tending to indicate that acceptance of the download will cause a minimum of interference with the subscriber's use of the set-top terminal (Col.5, lines 50-59). For instance, at col.5, line 56, Metz discloses downloading when the system is "OFF". Clearly, this meets the limitation of not interfering with the "subscribers use" as claimed since the TV would be "OFF" and not used at the time of the download.

Metz (US 5666293) does not specifically disclose the terminal being informed by a head-end of a specified in-band channel on which a download of data

Art Unit: 2711

or programming is offered to set-top terminal over a cable network (Fig. 1, element 15).

Metz (US 5978855) discloses the terminal being informed by a head-end of a specified in-band channel on which a download of data or programming is offered to set-top terminal over a cable network (Col.11, lines 10-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to improve Metz (US 5666293) by allowing an information provider to offer one or more interactive services utilizing a text server to provide instructions to the set top terminal as taught by Metz (US 5978855) in order to instruct the set top terminal to change to another channel and receive the application download (Col.11, lines 30-31).

Regarding claim 2, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein the one or more criteria are download to the set-top terminal over the cable network (Col.5, lines 25-50).

Regarding claim 3, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein the set-top terminal verifies that the data or programming offered as the download is not already resident in the memory (Col.5, lines 36-50).

Regarding claim 4, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein the set-top terminal verifies that the data or programming offered as the download is specified as being intended for a class of terminals to which the set-top terminal belongs (Col.5, lines 33-35).

Regarding claims 7, 21 and 39, they read on the cable operator in Metz (US 5666293) insuring that all set-top boxes have the latest version of software installed

Art Unit: 2711

by a given date. This is a common practice in the computer arts so that all computers can run the latest version of software distributed by the server.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Metz (US 5666293) by making sure all subscribers are updated by a given deadline in order that they all have benefit from latest versions of software that would not be useable if they were not updated.

Regarding claims 8, 22 and 40, it follows from the discussion of claim 21 that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Metz (US 5666293) in order to delay the downloading by deadline in the event that the set-top box was performing a recording feature so that the program being recorded would not be interrupted.

Regarding claim 9, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein the set-top terminal signals the subscriber that the download is available and requests permission to accept the download, the one or more criteria including a positive response by the subscriber to the request for permission to accept the download (Col.5, lines 50-60).

Regarding claim 10, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein the set-top terminal tunes to the specified in-band channel to receive the download if the one or more criteria (error free) are satisfied (Col. 10, lines 1-5).

Regarding claim 11, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein if the one or more criteria are satisfied, the processor erases information in the memory unit and replace the erased information with data or programming from the download (Col.10, lines 5-9).

Regarding claim 12, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein following the download of programming, the processor will only execute newly-received programming from the download when one or more predetermined criteria are satisfied (Col.10, lines 10-12).

Regarding claim 13, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein, prior to accepting the download, the processor determines whether any programming is stored in the memory which is not being executed, but which is identified as being later version than programming being executed by the processor at that time; if the processor locates any such later version of programming in memory, the processor will terminate execution of the programming being executed, erase the terminated programming from memory and reset so as to execute the later version of the programming (Col.9, lines 55-64).

Regarding claim 14, see analysis of claim 11.

Regarding claim 15, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein the memory unit is logically partitioned into two sections, a first section for containing programming being executed by the processor (ROM or non-volatile memory) (Col.10, lines 6-9) and a second section for receiving and storing programming from the download (RAM) (Col.10, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 16, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein each download of programming contains two versions of a programming object (MPEG packets stream), a first programming object for storage in and execution from a first memory section of the memory unit and a second programming object for storage in and execution from a second memory section, of the memory unit wherein the

Art Unit: 2711

processor downloads one of the two versions of programming in accordance with whether the first and second memory sections is vacant (Col.15, lines 60-67 and Col.16, lines 1-37) and (Col.37, lines 60-67 and Col.38, lines 1-38).

Regarding claim 17, see analysis of claim 15.

Regarding method claims 24 and 36, see analysis of apparatus claim.

Regarding claim 25, see analysis of claim 2.

Regarding claim 26, see analysis of claim 3.

Regarding claim 27, see analysis of claim 4.

Regarding claim 30, see analysis of claim 9.

Regarding claim 31, see analysis of claim 12.

Regarding claim 32, see analysis of claim 13.

Regarding claim 33, see analysis of claim 11.

Regarding claim 34, see analysis of claim 15.

Regarding claim 35, see analysis of claim 16.

Regarding claim 42, Metz (US 5666293) further discloses wherein the programming is received in packets (Col.16, lines 17-30), the terminal being configured to reassemble the packets into an executable object and stored into non-volatile memory (Col.10, lines 1-12)

Art Unit: 2711

2. Claims 5, 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al.(US 5666293) in view of Metz et al.(US 5978855), and further in view of Diehl et al. (US 5,373,557).

Regarding claims 5 and 28, Metz. (US 5666293) does not specifically show wherein the one or more criteria include a time of day.

Diehl et al shows a time of day criteria is included in the download of data (Diehl et al, Col.1, lines 55-60 and Col.3, lines 5-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Metz et al by including a time of day criteria in the download data in order to determine the possibility to download during the off peak hours of use.

3. Claims 6, 19, 29 and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al.(US 5666293) in view of Metz et al.(US 5978855), and further in view of Mankovitz(US.5,640,484) .

Regarding claim 6, Metz (US 5666293) does not specifically show one or more criteria include whether the set-top terminal is turned off.

Mankovitz shows a criteria to check whether or not the television is turned off (Col.1, lines 65-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Metz et al by inserting a criteria for verifying whether or not the set-top box is off, in order not to interrupt the television viewing during the download of data to the set-top box.

Regarding claims 19, 29 and 37, see analysis of claim 6.

Art Unit: 2711

4. Claims 20 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al.(US. 5,666,293) in view of Metz et al.(US 5978855), and further in view of Iggulden et al. (US 5,987,210).

Regarding claim 20, Metz fails to disclose that one or more criteria include detection of commercial break in television programming being received by set top terminal.

Iggulden shows a processor (114) for processing the video signal to detect the presence of commercial messages (Fig.1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Metz by inserting a video event detector to detect the criteria for commercial break in order to define the time for downloading software so it would not interfere with the viewer watching the main television program.

Regarding claim 38, see analysis of claim 20.

5. Claim 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al.(US. 5,666,293) in view of Metz et al.(US 5978855), and further in view of McClellan et al.(US. 5,619,250).

Regarding claim 23, Metz does not specifically show one or more criteria including a positive response by subscriber to request for permission to execute new programming.

McClellan shows that subscriber usually has to request to restart the set-top box in order to reset the set-top box to new configuration (Col.3, lines 19-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time

Art Unit: 2711

the invention was made, to modify Metz et al to include a criteria of requiring subscriber to request for permission to execute new programming in order to reset the set-top box to new configuration so it would not interrupt any current TV program being viewed.

6. Claim 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al. (US. 5,666,293) in view of So (US.5,909,559).

Regarding claim 41, Metz does not specifically show a set-top terminal with two processors wherein the first processor is dedicated to provide a user interface and a second processor is dedicated to manage the download process.

So shows a system with dual processors which operates multitask in dual processing mode (Fig.1, Col.129, lines 21-37, Fig.24, Col.137, lines 45-65 and Fig.94 and 95, Col.151, lines 39-67+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Metz by implementing a dual processors set-top terminal in order to improve the performance of multitasking task and interference with the broadcasting task by assigning the download task on one processor and the broadcasting service on the other processor.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2711

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2711

Contact Fax Information

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or Faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communication intended for entry)

or:

(703) 308-5399, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-7372. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-5399.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.



ANDREW I. FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

HT:ht
August 11, 2000